DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 472 UD 014 218

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | An Assessment of the Alternative Educational Program at Harlem Preparatory School. |
| INSTITUTION | Institute for Educational Development, New York, N.Y. |
| SPONS AGENCY | EXXON Corp., New York, N.Y.; Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y. |
| PUB DATE | Jun 73 |
| NOTE | 41p. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | Institute for Educational Development, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, New York 10017 ($3.00) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE |
| DESCRIPTORS | Academic Achievement; *Alternative Schools; College Admission; Disadvantaged Youth; Dropout Rehabilitation; Economically Disadvantaged; Private Schools; *Program Evaluation; *Remedial Programs; *Secondary Schools; Student Attitudes; Student Characteristics; *Urban Schools |
| IDENTIFIERS | New York City |

ABSTRACT

Harlem Preparatory School is an independent, nongraded, alternative school for young men and women who have either left high school before receiving a diploma, who wish to receive an academic diploma rather than a general or vocational diploma, or who wish to "recondition" their learning skills so that they may be better prepared to succeed in higher education. The Institute for Educational Development began its assessment of Harlem Preparatory School in December 1972. The plan was to collect information in two stages, the first quantitative, the second qualitative. In the first phase, school records were examined to obtain, insofar as possible, descriptive information concerning the school and its students, concentrating on the graduating classes of 1969, 1970, and 1971. The information thus obtained is summarized in the body of this report; the full annotated tables are appended. Also as a part of the first phase, a sample of students was interviewed to determine their attitudes and opinions about the school. In the second phase, three independent consultants conducted a qualitative assessment by making site visits to the school, observing classes, and speaking with faculty members and students. Resumes of the site visitors are appended. (Author/JM)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 091472

# AN ASSESSMENT

# OF THE

# ALTERNATIVE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

# AT

# HARLEM PREPARATORY SCHOOL

June 1973

UD 014210

Institute for Educational Development
52 Vanderbilt Avenue
New York, New York 10017

INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
52 VANDERBILT AVENUE, NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10017 · 212-686-8910

June 22, 1973

Dr. Edward F. Carpenter, Headmaster
Harlem Preparatory School
2535 Eighth Avenue
New York, New York 10030

Dear Dr. Carpenter:

We are pleased to submit with this letter our final report on the educational program at Harlem Preparatory School, along with other important information about the school and its operations.

The cooperation we received from you and other members of the administrative staff, faculty members, and students was unusual for an evaluative study of this kind. There is no question that the school has an open approach and a commitment to provide quality education. The body of the report itself confirms these qualities. In our experience few studies have been so interesting and rewarding to conduct.

In addition to expressing our appreciation to the participants - administrators, faculty members, students, and site visitors - for their contributions to the study, we also wish to thank the officers of The Exxon Corporation and The Ford Foundation for their interest in and thoughtful comments during the course of the study, as well as for their financial support.

We hope very much that the report will be useful to you and others in planning the future of Harlem Preparatory School.

Sincerely,

Dale E. Bussis

Dale E. Bussis
Vice President

and

Rita Senf

Rita Senf
Study Director

DEB/RS/dh
enclosure

## WHAT IS HARLEM PREPARATORY SCHOOL?

Harlem Preparatory School is an independent nongraded alternative school for young men and women who have either left high school before receiving a diploma, who wish to receive an academic diploma rather than a general or vocational diploma, or who wish to "recondition" their learning skills so they may be better prepared to succeed in higher education.

The philosophy underlying Harlem Prep is unique; as one student said, "It is before its time." Its purposes, which it seeks to implement vigorously, are: relevant academic preparation of students, giving personal and social responsibility to the students for their own learning and life, and a commitment on the part of the institution to help the students to be admitted to college. The last purpose is important because nearly all its students come from families with low incomes, and in many cases have no means of financial support whatever.

## ASSESSMENT PLAN

The Institute for Educational Development (IED) began its assessment of Harlem Preparatory School in December 1972. The plan was to collect information in two stages, the first quantitative, the second qualitative. In the first phase, school records were examined to obtain, insofar as possible, descriptive information concerning the school and its students, concentrating on the graduating classes of 1969, 1970, and 1971. The information thus obtained is summarized in the body of this report; the full annotated tables are appended. Also as part of the first phase, a sample of students was interviewed to determine their attitudes and opinions about the school. In the second phase, three independent consultants conducted a qualitative assessment by making site visits to the school, observing classes and speaking with faculty members and students. (Resumes of the site visitors are appended.)

## SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE TYPICAL HARLEM PREP STUDENT (1969-1971)

The quantitative information obtained from examination of school records is presented in detail in the appended tables. The summary description below gives the highlights of the findings concerning students.

Before entering Harlem Prep, the typical student who later graduated had attended a large public high school in New York City. He had probably completed part or all of the 12th grade (or at least part of the 10th grade), but probably not in an academic course, and his grades were poor. The typical student was probably black, was unmarried, and was about 2 or 3 times more likely to be male than female. When he graduated, his age was probably 19 or 20.

While at Harlem Prep, he was most likely to live in Manhattan; almost all students lived in New York City. He had a time lapse of less than 1 year between leaving high school and entering Harlem Prep, and attended Harlem Prep for two consecutive semesters, taking 5 or 6 courses each semester. (Students who entered in 1971 had a slightly higher possibility than earlier students of taking a leave of absence and then returning to Harlem Prep.) He was likely to receive grades of A or B in more than half his courses. He was likely to receive no credit (D) in less than one-fifth of his courses, and if this happened, it was likely to be in his first semester.

Unless he was a 1970 graduate, it is likely that he had no entry reading score recorded. If a reading score was recorded, it was likely to be at the 11th grade achievement level (which was probably close to his actual grade level). If he took the PSAT, he probably scored between 30 and 39 on both Verbal and Math tests, with a slightly higher score on the Verbal test. If he took the SAT, he probably scored between 300 and 399, and almost certainly between 200 and 500, on both the Verbal and Math tests. Again his Verbal score was probably slightly higher than his Math score.

After graduation from Harlem Prep, the typical student attended a college in New York City, New York State, or a nearby state. Whether he graduated in 1969, 1970, or 1971, there is about a 50-50 chance that he is still enrolled in college. If he is enrolled, he is doing fairly good academic work and is expected to graduate.

For the typical student who attended Harlem Prep but did not graduate upon leaving, it is highly probable that no information is available about what he is doing now. If, however, we consider only those non-graduates for whom some information is available, there is some likelihood that he is in college or definitely planning to attend college soon. But if he is not in college, he is probably working, possibly in military service.

## INTERVIEWS WITH STUDENTS

What is it about Harlem Prep that attracts students? The above paragraphs give an indication, but they do not touch on the experiential facets of what it means to attend Harlem Prep. Structured interviews with 14 current students selected at random (with each interview lasting about 45 minutes), personal conversations with staff members, observations of the school in operation, and the data collected provide the background for the following remarks under three main headings: 1) physical environment, 2) psychological environment, and 3) educational environment.

## Physical Environment

The physical environment is not that of a conventional high school. Harlem Prep is housed in a converted supermarket. As one student reported, there is "not a door for each room." Rather, there is a sense of "openness," not only within the class areas, but also with respect to access to administrators and staff members. Although some students, at first sight, feared that they would not be able to concentrate in such an open setting, they reported that their initial apprehensions were not borne out; they found that the openness did not interfere with their concentration and learning.

Another aspect of the physical environment that might at first appear to be a handicap is probably in some ways an advantage. In contrast to the size of the public high schools these students previously attended, and where many of them felt lost or uncared for, Harlem Prep is not "huge." Its student body (approximately 500 students) is manageable for everyone - administrators, faculty members, and students.

## Psychological Environment

Education does not take place only in a physical environment or through a curriculum. It requires an appropriate atmosphere for learning A visitor entering Harlem Prep senses an enthusiasm, an élan. Students' responses in the interviews gave a wide range of statements as to how students perceived Harlem Prep to be different from their previous high schools. Perhaps surprisingly, it was not failing grades that had put them on the path toward leaving school, but was more likely to be boredom, apathy, and poor attendance. They came to Harlem Prep because of its promise to help them learn, in a different atmosphere. Among the more frequently given reasons for attending were these: the school is like a family, like a home; the atmosphere is looser, less rigid, less pressured; there is more trust. The faculty members are helpful, they care about how the students are learning, they convey a sincerity in wanting the students to learn, and go out of their way to tutor students who are having academic difficulty. Students get a second chance. Quiet or introverted students are not neglected; faculty members draw out responses from them and elicit their participation. Perhaps the first-name basis that prevails among everyone at the school facilitates this participation. Not only are the faculty members interested in the students' academic progress, but the students also respond to them as counselors and friends who will help them with emotional or social problems.

Although fiscal matters are not ordinarily associated with the psychological environment of a school, there are two instances concerning finance which demonstrate the commitment and dedication of the faculty and the student body to Harlem Prep. The first is that the administrators and staff members at Harlem Prep were willing to take a reduction in salary to meet a financial crisis during the 1972-73 school year. The second is that the school, although tuition-free, serving predominantly ghetto young people, has raised approximately $20,000 annually as self-support. Surely this fact in itself deserves the attention and interest of public and private sources in maintaining the institution.

Educational Environment

The educational environment is one that prepares students for college. (Acceptance for college enrollment is one necessary requirement for graduation.) Harlem Prep, as a nongraded school, avoids the lock-step of most high schools by providing a flexible scheduling and selection of courses (other than English and math, which are required). Course scheduling and grading are like those in college. There is joint decision-making between students and faculty members in the selection of courses. Students are encouraged to be responsible for their own work, and their interview responses show that they take this responsibility seriously. Example, apparently, is still among the greatest of teachers; as one student observed, "The faculty members have been through it; they know what you will need." But students also emphasized their attitude that "it's up to you to make it yourself." Perhaps the most striking theme that came through in the interviews was the emphasis the students placed on "learning," rather than on "school" or "teaching."

The last two questions of the interview dealt with what the students would feel if Harlem Prep were to close, and what they would do if that happened. The most poignant remark was, "I'd feel like a first-born child had died." The responses to the latter question ranged from, "I'd be back on the street," "I'd work and go to night school," to "I'd make it somehow." One student replied that he would try to start another Harlem Prep.

## SITE VISITS

As part of its study of Harlem Prep, IED employed three consultants as site visitors to make independent qualitative assessments of Harlem Prep's educational program The consultants were selected not only on the basis of their expertise in secondary education, but also for their diversity of experience across representative areas within secondary education. These areas included experience in large city high schools (both traditional and experimental), in a suburban high school having a dominant focus on college preparation, and in private preparatory schools. By including these perspectives, it was expected that a reasonably comprehensive view of Harlem Prep's program would be obtained.

Before their visits, the consultants met with the IED staff to discuss the guidelines for the site visits and to outline the areas of the educational program to which they would direct special attention. The consultants were also provided with the data that had been collected as background material for their visits. In visitng Harlem Prep, they were requested to record their impressions. The consultants visited Harlem Prep three times over a period of two weeks; during their visits they acted independently, each carrying out particular assignments. At the end of this period, they reconvened in late May, along with the two senior members of the IED staff, to discuss their findings.

This report is a summary of their observations, suggestions, and recommendations, grouped according to the following categories: general impressions, administration, facilities, library, teaching staff and curriculum, and guidance. In general, considering the diversity of the backgrounds of the consultants, there was a high degree of consensus concerning each of the areas covered.

## General Impressions

There was remarkable agreement among the three site visitors in their impressions and conclusions about Harlem Prep. Their comments were corroborative of each other and of the earlier findings we have already reported. This agreement assumed all the more significance because they conducted their assignments independently of each other. They were in complete agreement that Harlem Prep is a unique institution, and that it is concentrating on the primary aim it has set for itself, namely, to prepare students for college.

The site visitors were unanimous in their enthusiasm for the school. They made few criticisms; whenever they did, they immediately qualified the criticisms by reiterating their overall positive impressions and their recognition that choices are dictated by Harlem Prep's adherence to proper priorities, that is, that students come before anything else.

All three site visitors were impressed by the general atmosphere of good feeling, easy interaction and communication, and the absence of anti-white feeling. They "felt at home" in the school; they were not treated as intruders nor with suspicion, and they encountered none of the defensiveness which is commonly shown to evaluators. The visitors saw no hostility or arguments or discipline problems. The prevailing emotional tone is nonviolent, or, as one visitor expressed it, "gentle yet militant" (i.e., militant in pursuit of the school's defined goals). This was not surprising because, as the visitors said, alternative schools for minority groups have been conservative rather than radical.

The visitors repeatedly stressed their view that Harlem Prep is conservative in its stress on basic education; as one visitor said, it is an example of "brilliant conservatism," although a "humane conservatism." They perceived the school's aim as strongly academic, with a focus on traditional academic work, although this aim is accomplished in nontraditional ways. They felt that there is a desirable combining of humanistic and intellectual values.

The visitors were emphatic about their feeling that, in all areas and activities, and given the financial restrictions, the correct choice of priorities guides decisions.

Administration

The visitors were very much impressed with the top leadership of the school. They attributed the close adherence to proper priorities to these people. "The first priority goes to students, which is right." The top administrators are leaders, and their qualities complement one another. They do not act as buddies or pals of the students, but rather, while remaining warm and open, they hold to their focus on and commitment to intellectual achievement, and persist in placing responsibility for that achievement on the student. Unobtrusive indicators that the students accept responsibility for the atmosphere in which their education takes place are the absence of graffiti and of vandalism or thefts; no equipment has ever been lost. The school does, of course, take adequate precautions concerning equipment, keeping it locked up when it is not in use, and keeping records of borrowers when it is lent out.

At levels below the top administration, the site visitors felt there were some limitations among the staff in terms of leadership potential; that is, they saw no evidence that there is anyone waiting in the wings who could take over in providing the kind of leadership that now exists. Although there was no clear indication of demoralization among the faculty because of Harlem Prep's financial difficulties, the visitors expressed some concern that this might become a problem.

The visitors all agreed as to the poor quality of record-keeping and record-planning. They hastened to qualify this comment by recognizing that when funds and personnel are scarce, students properly come first, not records. Still, they emphasized the many values that could accrue to the school from better records, kept up to date. They remarked that it was not that there was no record-keeping, but that it would be advantageous to plan record-keeping so that regular routine procedures are maintained; then the school could much more easily show to others at any time what it is accomplishing, and would also be able to use the information for its own planning. To assemble such data in special one-time retrospective efforts is expensive and not very reliable.

Teachers are recording attendance in their record books. School attendance records, however, had not been cumulated since January. Again, staff time goes to students, not record-keeping. If a student is absent several days in succession, an effort is made to reach him, determine what the problem is, and help with solutions if possible. The site visitors emphasized the fact that there are no psychological absences from classes. Such a situation is very common in the public schools, where students may sit in class but actually be completely uninvolved in what the teacher is trying to accomplish. At Harlem Prep, however, no one requires a student to sit in class; he is free to get up and leave if he wishes. As a result of this policy, those students who are present in a class are highly attentive and involved. "There is a low tedium level at Harlem Prep." One site visitor expressed the opinion that this situation may be too free for some students who may not be ready for so much self-direction.

The site visitors had essentially no opportunity to observe student and parent involvement in major decision-making and in the planning of courses. There are, however, five parent representatives and one student representative on the school's board of trustees. Parents' involvement in school affairs was clearly visible at the recent graduation, where parents took part in the program, and one graduate's mother received an award. In relation to the planning and selection of courses, each year in the late spring and in the early fall both faculty members and students have a voice in decisions about courses to be offered.

Facilities

Like many other people at their first encounter with this school, the first impression of the site visitors was of noise and lack of partitions and privacy. But before the end of their first day, they had all quickly adjusted to the situation and were able to ignore distractions and to concentrate their attention, in spite of what had originally seemed to be unacceptable learning conditions.

The site visitors saw a need for better science laboratory facilities, better music and media facilities, and possibly a gymnasium. Boys especially miss sports facilities. One visitor felt there should be better facilties for teachers to do private work, although at the same time he would not want to separate the teachers from the students. The other two visitors, however, felt that the disadvantages of private office space for teachers would outweigh the advantages. All these suggestions should be regarded as "Wouldn't it be nice?" comments. One visitor summed up the views of all of them by saying that "Harlem Prep makes better use of space than any place I have ever seen."

Library

The visitors devoted considerable discussion to the inadequacy of the library. Most books are donated. There are few periodicals, few science books, no Readers' Guide. The card catalog is poor; it was estimated that 90% of the books are not listed in the card catalog. Since there is no money budgeted for the library, the visitors recognize the practical limitations, but they felt that it is essential for students who are going to college to learn how to use a library before they arrive at college. They felt that Harlem Prep should give a higher priority to a "library as a resource center." At present the school has no qualified librarian. A good library needs, besides books, a regular librarian who can help students learn how to locate and use resources. The visitors suggested investigating the possibility of getting cooperation from a public librarian in a nearby location, or perhaps a retired librarian at the school.

The visitors stressed that learning the methods for use is what matters, not having all the books. They suggested that there be a closer coordination between the librarian and the teachers in the use of the library for research projects undertaken by students. The minimum need is for the curriculum to include information on how to use a library. With such background, and given the current financial limitations, students could carry out research in public libraries.

With regard to the use of other media, the visitors observed that the staff member in charge of media worked with students, but not with teachers. They suggested that if the media person could work more with teachers, this could enlarge the teachers' knowledge of resources, which they could then transmit to students.

Teaching Staff and Curriculum

In the brief time available to the site visitors, it was difficult for them to judge teacher qualifications and, more importantly, teacher performance. Their general impression, however, was that Harlem Prep has an excellent teaching staff, with some variation in quality, as might be expected. One visitor commented that "the (observed) sociology teacher seemed better qualified than would be some Ph.D.'s in sociology, or MATs." The teachers have dedication and appear to have knowledge of their subject matter. They are concerned that their students should learn. Teachers have considerable autonomy concerning their approaches to teaching.

The site visitors made it perfectly clear that they do not place a high value on teachers' paper qualifications. In later comments, they suggested that if Harlem Prep should become affiliated with the New York City Board of Education, their advice would be to seek a variance concerning teacher certification requirements, so that the school can retain teachers it now has who would not meet Board of Education standards.

Concerning teaching methods and lesson planning, the visitors were clear that there was room for improvement, particularly among the less experienced teachers. They said they saw much conservative teaching. One visitor observed what he regarded as dead grammar lessons. Another visitor disagreed somewhat, feeling that the students need an emphasis on language usage. They reconciled this difference by agreeing that more interesting approaches are available for the teaching of grammar and usage.

The visitors regarded lesson planning as imaginative but not systematic, and felt that the techniques used were not, in general, very innovative. They sensed that the teachers reject traditional approaches to lesson planning, and they tended to agree with the teachers that overly rigid plans can be stifling. On the other hand, to require some systematic planning can be helpful in improving teaching. For beginning teachers especially, it would be beneficial for them to write down what they intend to do.

The visitors noted a lack of systematic programs for teacher improvement. For example, teachers could teach one another more. Teachers could improve their use of questioning; some teachers seemed to supply answers too quickly. There is room for improvement in the use of techniques for stimulating discussion by students; teachers could remove themselves, more than they do, as authority figures in the teaching situation, so as to let students do more discussion. This last comment should be balanced, however, by the almost universal attitude held by the students that the teachers really care about them and their learning.

In the classes they observed, the visitors saw little role-playing, little use of inductive teaching, and no use of media. They recognized that the latter may be due to lack of resources and personnel.

In summary, some teachers are in need of teacher training. The site visitors felt that new methods would be relatively easy to convey, but that the school needs a structured and ongoing effort at teacher improvement and staff development.

Teachers teach a minimum of five courses (20 class hours per week); in addition, they are expected to be available for the rest of the school day, from 9 to 4. The average class size is 15 to 20. Science classes are smaller, with about 8 to 10 students. The visitors saw some larger groups in session, but they suspected that these groups probably included students who were not formally enrolled in the course but were present because they were interested in the topic being presented. An example they observed was of a policeman who was making a presentation that drew a very large audience.

The visitors examined samples of students' written work, making comparisons between papers written at the beginning of this school year and recently written papers. They saw considerable improvement in the written products over the span of a year.

The students are required to take an English and a math course each semester; their remaining courses (usually four others) are elective.

The mathematics department has available a good statement on math teaching techniques. There is little use of board work in class; instead, the teacher makes an individual "contract" with the student concerning what he is expected to accomplish. Many students need tutoring outside of classes, for this purpose there is wide use of volunteer tutors from the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey.

The school uses no tracking system. The site visitors felt that this use of heterogeneous grouping might have either desirable or undesirable consequences. They were not recommending for or against tracking, but merely indicating that in some circumstances it might have advantages. Without tracking, obviously individual attention to students assumes greater importance, but students do seem to get whatever attention they need.

## Guidance

The approach to providing guidance services is "interwoven in the fabric of the school," which obviates to some extent the need for a formal guidance program as it is usually perceived. The common burden for guidance counselors of handling discipline problems seems not to exist, the main reason being that the school does not have many rules that can be broken. Communication between staff and students is always open. The students need role images, and find these in the staff.

There is one staff member with the specific assignment of guidance counseling, but the way she functions is not highly structured. For example, students don't need to make advance appointments to see her, because she is almost always available. Or students can approach and get help from any staff member they choose; the help appears to be freely given as needed. The responsibility for seeking help rests with the student. The staff members care about the students as individuals, but the focus of this caring is to support and facilitate the student's academic progress. Students reported that the teachers are concerned with them as persons, not only in regard to academic matters but personal problems and difficulties as well.

The site visitors commented somewhat unfavorably on the use of the Gates-McGinitie Reading Test for entry screening purposes. This test is designed for grades 3 to 10, levels that seem low for these students. Some alternative tests (e.g., California) were suggested, although there are possible criticisms of these tests, too. On the other hand, the particular reading test used and the score obtained may not be of crucial significance in reaching decisions about admission of students. The staff members are by now quite experienced in this process, and the other information they obtain through applications and interviews may be more important than a particular test score.

The concern of these students is with learning what the teachers have to offer; the students' prime emphasis, as in the whole institution, is on completing their academic work. Also, given the atmosphere of free and open communication, it seems highly unlikely that student problems or resentments could build up and produce rebellion or conflict.

In judging what Harlem Prep does for its students, it is absolutely essential to keep in mind that these are young people who would otherwise perhaps not even have a high school diploma, and very probably would not have gone to college. Without the Harlem Prep experience, their personal satisfactions in life achievements and their potential contributions to society would undoubtedly have been very limited for most of them.

In this connection, the guidance function of the college placement office was noted. The vigorous efforts of that office demonstrate the commitment of Harlem Prep not only to prepare students for college but to help them get admitted as well.

Summary

The visitors expressed a sense of frustration about how difficult it is to measure the "humanistic climate" they saw, and convey to outsiders in words all the positive benefits the school provides. It cannot be said that any of the visitors went with a negative attitude, but one at least went with a definitely neutral or "show me" attitude, and with some prejudice against the universal desirability of a college education. Even this visitor, by the end of his visits, was convinced, along with the others, that the purpose of Harlem Prep should not be changed. After six years of operation, the school has demonstrated that it can take high school students who have been low achievers or potential troublemakers, and educate them so that many of them can "climb the ladder" in our social structure, graduating from college and becoming productive members of society who have personal satisfaction in the contributions they are making. As one visitor said, people with this much ability and energy are going to do something with their talents, but unless constructive channels are available to them, these talents may be directed in destructive ways.

The "elite" feeling among the staff and students at Harlem Prep does not lead to competition with other schools; teachers and staff do not criticize other schools. If students find fault with their previous schooling, the effort is to redirect their attention to their present opportunities and away from any preoccupation with past shortcomings or failures.

Students, in talking with the site visitors, commented on the freedom to learn, the family atmosphere, and the fact that Harlem Prep is less competitive than their former high school. They say they have to write many term papers. Students have to be pressed to express any criticisms at all; when they do, they include a need for more money, space, facilities, and books. For many of them, Harlem Prep represents a "last chance" to make it in our society.

The visitors felt that there is great value in having and maintaining such a school physically located in Harlem. Although the visitors are aware that there is student and parent involvement in sustaining the school and raising funds, they suggested that it would be desirable for the school to give more attention to developing its community relations - defining community in a broad sense.

At the end of the debriefing session the site visitors were asked, "How would you change Harlem Prep if you were to become the headmaster?" With the exception of the need for more systematic record-keeping, all three site visitors were very reluctant to suggest any changes until they would have the opportunity to "live" at Harlem Prep for some time. One site visitor suggested the possibility of widening the aim of Harlem Prep to include some aspects of career education, in view of the number of students who do not complete their education there or who do not go on to college. That concept was challenged by the other visitors, because it would destroy the uniqueness of Harlem Prep. The conflict was resolved in the recognition that Harlem Prep is a model of what is possible for students in continuing their education; the whole spectrum of higher education is open to the students, rather than just the track of community colleges which is so common for students from ghetto areas.

When asked whether in the opinion of the site visitors Harlem Prep would have to undergo substantial changes if it were to become a part of the New York City Board of Education, there was general agreement that it would be better if it did not have to do so. The responses ranged from "the school deserves to live," to the response that if Harlem Prep were to become a part of the New York City system, it should strive to maintain both its purposes and autonomy by negotiating variances both with the Board of Education and the United Federation of Teachers concerning such matters as teacher qualifications and other Board regulations.

Other options were suggested to maintain Harlem Prep. They included establishing Harlem Prep as an independent school district, becoming affiliated with a university as an experimental school, and having the Board of Education pay the teachers' salaries. Among concluding remarks were that Harlem Prep is using the best advantages of independent schools, and that it is very difficult to operate experimental schools on a year-to-year funding, although this seems to be the pattern in both the private and public sectors.

## APPENDIX

### LIST OF ANNOTATED TABLES


1. COMMENT AND CAUTION

2. FOLLOWUP INFORMATION ON THE 35 HARLEM PREP GRADUATES OF 1968 (FIRST GRADUATING CLASS)

3. FOLLOWUP INFORMATION ON COLLEGE OUTCOMES FOR THE GRADUATING CLASSES OF 1969, 1970, AND 1971

4. NUMBER OF GRADUATES WITH SOME INFORMATION AVAILABLE (1969-71); SEX; MARITAL STATUS WHILE AT HARLEM PREP

5. BOROUGH OR PLACE OF RESIDENCE WHILE AT HARLEM PREP; AGE AT GRADUATION FROM HARLEM PREP

6. LAST REGULAR HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDED PRIOR TO ENTERING HARLEM PREP (LOCATION AND TYPE)

7. GRADE COMPLETED IN LAST REGULAR HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDED BEFORE ENTERING HARLEM PREP

8. TIME LAPSE BETWEEN LEAVING REGULAR HIGH SCHOOL AND ENTERING HARLEM PREP

9. READING SCORES AT ENTRY

10. NUMBER OF SEMESTERS SPENT AT HARLEM PREP

11. GRADES WHILE AT HARLEM PREP (HONOR GRADES AND NO-CREDIT GRADES)

12. PSAT SCORES

13. SAT SCORES

14. LOCATION OF ACCEPTING COLLEGES (1969-1971)

15. FOLLOWUP INFORMATION ON A SAMPLE OF PRESUMED NONGRADUATES

16. ENROLLMENT FROM STREET ACADEMIES; VETERANS AT HARLEM PREP

17. EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE OF CURRENT FACULTY

18. CURRICULUM: NUMBER OF COURSES OFFERED, BY DEPARTMENT

19. STUDENT ATTENDANCE

20. STUDENT COSTS

21. LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL OF AUDITOR'S REPORT

22. RESUMES OF SITE VISITORS: FREDERICK J. KOURY, ROBERT C. ATMORE, AND HENRY N. DREWRY

COMMENT AND CAUTION

The reader who examines these tables should keep in mind that most of the information here pertains only to students who graduated. It can be assumed that they are different from students who did not graduate, but we do not know in what specific ways. It was not possible to obtain comparable data for nongraduates, for whom only sparse information was available, and only for a small sample of them.

Where estimations or approximations were involved, that fact is noted in the table. Of perhaps greater importance is missing data; inspection of the lines in the tables labeled "N with no data" will indicate that in many cases information was not available for a considerable proportion of the students.

The notion of "admissions" to a particular graduating "class" is not applicable to Harlem Prep students, since the amount of time they will spend at the school is not predetermined. It is therefore not possible to compare the number of students admitted and the number graduated in any particular class or year. The following figures give a rough idea of the number of students who did not graduate. In 1968-69 there were 183 students and 77 graduates. In 1969-70 there were 283 students and 83 graduates. In 1970-71 there were 400 students and 126 graduates. Some portion of those who did not graduate in a given year returned and graduated in a following year.

FOLLOWUP INFORMATION ON THE 35 HARLEM PREP GRADUATES OF 1968
(FIRST GRADUATING CLASS)

Total N = 35 graduates

16 graduated from college in June 1972
1 needs 2 credits for college graduation
3 are still in college (2 took a leave of absence)
6 attended college for 2 years and then dropped out
8 attended college, but no further information is available
1 attended college but is now deceased

This first graduating class contained 30 male and 5 female students. The followup information is very impressive; all 35 graduates entered college, and about half of them completed college within 4 years. The majority attended college in New York City or elsewhere in New York State. Five of the college graduates are now teaching at Harlem Prep. One graduate is in medical school, and one is working in special educational programs at the university he attended.

SAT Verbal and Math scores were available for 32 of the 35 graduates. The majority of scores on both tests were in the 300's. Of the 16 who have graduated from college, 7 had both Verbal and Math scores below 400; for one of these, both scores were below 300. Five other students had either a Verbal or Math score below 300; of these 5 students, 2 graduated from college and 1 is still in college after a leave of absence. Many students had SAT scores considerably below the means for the college they were attending. Only 3 Verbal scores and only 2 Math scores were above 500; of the 3 students represented by these scores, 1 is in medical school, 1 graduated from college, and 1 is still in college.

In summary, inspection of SAT scores in relation to college outcomes after four years indicates that Harlem Prep graduates with relatively high scores are likely to succeed in college; but they also indicate that low SAT scores are not necessarily predictive of failure in college.

FOLLOWUP INFORMATION AS OF DECEMBER 1973 ON COLLEGE OUTCOMES
FOR THE HARLEM PREP GRADUATING CLASSES OF 1969, 1970, AND 1971

Requests for information on the college careers of 264 Harlem Prep graduates of 1969, 1970, and 1971 were sent to 110 colleges early in March. As of June 1973, replies had been received for 174 students. Between June and December 1973, additional followup information was received. The figures below are based on 210 students, or 80% of the total for whom information was requested.

| | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| No information, or no record of enrollment at college queried | 17% | 13% | 21% | 17% |
| Attended college but now deceased | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Still enrolled in college queried | 36 | 44 | 34 | 38 |
| Not still enrolled in college queried | 45 | 43 | 45 | 44 |
| | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Total number of students for whom replies were received | 64 | 70 | 76 | 210 |
| Total number of student queries sent | 74 | 77 | 113 | 264 |
| Percentage of student replies received | 86% | 91% | 67% | 80% |

Several cautions apply to any interpretation of these returns. All the information tabulated is based on replies from the colleges, and usually on just one college query per student. In some cases Harlem Prep faculty members told us that a student was in the process of transferring, or about to be accepted at another college, in the Army, etc; such information was not tallied. It is interesting that the percentage of replies received was highest for the first two years, and dropped off for 1971. For any student tallied above as not enrolled in a college we queried, we usually have no way of knowing whether or not he then attended another college. Also, some students attended junior colleges or community colleges, and may have considered their education complete at the end of two years. Concerning transfers, our information is very incomplete; a college usually does not have information on where a student goes or what he does after he leaves that college. The information that is available suggests that many of these students do transfer, and sometimes move from poor grades at the first school to much better grades at the second school. If a college we queried had no record of a student's enrollment, he probably entered a different college. Many students entered branches of CUNY or SUNY; if these colleges replied at all, it was usually to state that they could give no information without a student release. The latter cases were not pursued further. A large proportion of the nonreplies and "no information" categories involved CUNY and SUNY colleges.

Keeping all these cautions in mind, it seems fair to estimate from the results received that close to half the students who entered college are still there. Those listed as "still enrolled" were mostly rated as "good" in overall academic

performance, and it was expected that they would graduate. Those "not still enrolled" generally had shown "poor" overall academic performance; many left their college after one year, but the length of stay ranged up to 2 or 3 years. About 20% of those "not still enrolled" had "fair" or "good" academic achievement; it is quite possible that these students transferred to another college.

Judging from the replies received, one difference is suggested when these three groups are compared with the 1968 Harlem Prep graduates. The suggestion is that somewhat fewer students will enter college immediately after their graduation from Harlem Prep and go straight through four years of college. Some waited a year before entering college; some took a leave of absence and then returned to college. It is too soon, however, to reach definite conclusions about these trends, because the results cannot yet be based on a full four years of college experience.

NUMBER OF GRADUATES WITH SOME INFORMATION AVAILABLE (1969-1971)

| 1969 | 1970 | 1971 |
|---|---|---|
| N=77 | N=80 | N=123 |

Information on some items shown in the tables that follow was not available for some students. Unless otherwise noted, the percentages shown are based on students whose scores were available; this N is shown under each column of percentages as "N with data." The "N with no data" is also shown where it applies.

SEX

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Male | 73% | 64% | 63% |
| Female | 27 | 36 | 37 |
| | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| N with data | 77 | 80 | 123 |

In all these graduating classes, there were many more male than female students. In 1969, the ratio was about 3 to 1; in 1970 and 1971 the ratio was somewhat more equal - about 2 to 1.

MARITAL STATUS WHILE AT HARLEM PREP

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Single or probably single | 86% | 96% | 94% |
| Married | 12 | 3 | 5 |
| Separated | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| N with data | 77 | 80 | 123 |

Most of the students in these groups were single. Very few of them had any children; 7 in the 1969 group, 3 in the 1970 group, and 5 in the 1971 group had children. The number of children ranged from 1 to 5.

BOROUGH OR PLACE OF RESIDENCE WHILE AT HARLEM PREP

| | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Manhattan | 48% | 40% | 37% |
| Bronx | 27 | 23 | 25 |
| Brooklyn | 11 | 21 | 20 |
| Queens | 14 | 12 | 15 |
| New York suburban | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| New Jersey | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| N with data | 77 | 77 | 118 |
| N with no data | 0 | 3 | 5 |

These students most commonly lived in Manhattan while attending Harlem Prep. Many of them also lived in the Bronx, Brooklyn, or Queens. What these figures do not show is the amount of mobility in the students' backgrounds. Many of them, for example, have moved from one borough to another, or from the South or Puerto Rico to New York City. One student came from Detroit to attend Harlem Prep, and went back to Detroit after graduation and entered college there.

AGE AT GRADUATION FROM HARLEM PREP

| | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 17 - 18 | 8% | 15% | 22% |
| 19 - 20 | 61 | 43 | 36 |
| 21 - 22 | 18 | 29 | 21 |
| 23 - 25 | 10 | 8 | 18 |
| Over 25 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| N with data | 77 | 79 | 121 |
| N with no data | 0 | 1 | 2 |

These students were most commonly 19 or 20 years old when they graduated from Harlem Prep. The next most common age at graduation was 21 or 22. It was very rare for a student to be over 25, although one was 36 and one was 50. By 1971, there was more dispersion across the age range than in 1969.

LAST REGULAR HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDED PRIOR
TO ENTERING HARLEM PREP (LOCATION AND TYPE)

Many of these students attended more than one high school before coming to Harlem Prep. The percentages below refer to the last regular high school attended.

| | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 |
|---|---|---|---|
| New York City: | | | |
| Public | 88% | 90% | 84% |
| Catholic | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Newark Prep | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| Other N.Y. State and New Jersey | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| Other non-Southern U.S. | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Southern U.S. | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| P.R., Jamaica, Trinidad | 4 | 0 | 2 |
| S.W. Africa, Upper Volta | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| N with data | 77 | 78 | 121 |
| N with no data | 0 | 2 | 2 |

The outstanding feature of the tabulations above is the very large number of students who attended a large public New York City high school. In their autobiographical sketches, it was common for students to report that they liked school and did well until the 9th grade, which they may have attended in a junior high school. For many of them, problems began in the 10th grade, when they went to a huge public senior high school.

GRADE COMPLETED IN LAST REGULAR HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDED BEFORE ENTERING HARLEM PREP

(This information involves many approximations.)

| | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10th grade (part or all) | 12% | 6% | 26% |
| 11th grade (part or all) | 13 | 12 | 32 |
| 12th grade (part or all) | 75 | 82 | 42 |
| | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| N with data | 61 | 17 | 31 |
| N with no data | 16 | 63 | 92 |

Precise information concerning the student's schooling prior to entering Harlem Prep was very incomplete. For the 1970 and 1971 groups, if the student had graduated from his regular high school, that fact was recorded; but if he had not, then it was difficult to determine how much schooling he had completed. High school transcripts were often too blurred or faint to read; or the information on them was inconsistent with other definite information that was available.

More information was available for the 1969 group; this was taken largely from the student's autobiographical sketch. The 1970 and 1971 groups seldom had such a sketch in their folders. The large majority of the 1969 class had completed part or all of the 12th grade, and all of them had at least started the 10th grade. The students' autobiographical sketches revealed a wealth of other information, not apparent in the figures above, about the students' efforts to continue their education after leaving high school. Some went to evening school after leaving high school; some took High School Equivalency exams while in the Armed Forces or elsewhere; a few were accepted by a college or even attended a college for a short time before failing and then entering Harlem Prep.

It was also difficult to determine what kind of course the student was taking in his regular high school. This information was available for only 33 of the 77 students who graduated from Harlem Prep in 1969. Their courses were evenly divided among academic, general, and vocational. Many of these students, however, shifted from one kind of course to another while they were in high school. They might start in an academic course, do poorly, and then shift to general. Or they might complete a general or vocational course, but then realize in their senior year that they lacked courses necessary for college entrance.

TIME LAPSE BETWEEN LEAVING REGULAR
HIGH SCHOOL AND ENTERING HARLEM PREP

(This information involves many approximations.)

| | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 - 4 months | 44% | 45% | 35% |
| 5 - 11 months | 25 | 16 | 22 |
| 1 year | 10 | 15 | 17 |
| 2 - 3 years | 10 | 13 | 13 |
| 4 - 10 years | 8 | 8 | 12 |
| Over 10 years | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| N with data | 77 | 74 | 110 |
| N with no data | 0 | 6 | 13 |

The majority of students in these graduating classes had a time gap of less than one year between leaving their previous school and entering Harlem Prep. Many of them left school in June and entered Harlem Prep in the following September. For roughly one-tenth of these students, however, this interval was from 4 to 10 years or more.

READING SCORES AT ENTRY

Different reading tests were given to the 1969 class and the other classes, so the scores will be presented separately.

1969 Reading Grade Equivalent Scores (Gates-McGinitie Form 2)

| | |
|---|---|
| 8.0 - 8.9 | 6% |
| 9.0 - 9.9 | 24 |
| 10.0 - 10.9 | 18 |
| 11.0 - 11.9 | 37 |
| 12.0 - 12.9 | 15 |
| | 100% |
| N with data | 33 |
| N with no data | 44 |

The range of grade equivalent scores was from 8.7 to 12.5. Of the students for whom scores were available, almost all scored at least at the 9th grade level or better, and a little over half of them scored at or above the 11th grade level.

1970 and 1971 Reading Scores

(STEP Test 2A - Sequential Tests of Educational Progress)

| | 1970 | 1971 |
|---|---|---|
| 231 - 250 | 2% | 0% |
| 251 - 270 | 5 | 23 |
| 271 - 290 | 35 | 27 |
| 291 - 310 | 47 | 50 |
| 311 - 330 | 11 | 0 |
| | 100% | 100% |
| | 62 | 22 |
| | 18 | 101 |

On this test the national norm for the 11th grade is 289.5, and for the 12th grade, 293.7. For the Harlem Prep graduates, the large majority of scores fell between 271 and 310; that is, the scores centered around the national norms. (Note that percentages for 1971 are based on only 22 scores.)

NUMBER OF SEMESTERS SPENT AT HARLEM PREP

(In these figures, a summer session has been counted as a semester.)

| | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 semester | 17% | 9% | 2% |
| 2 semesters | 69 | 62 | 67 |
| 3 semesters | 8 | 22 | 8 |
| 4 semesters | 5 | 6 | 18 |
| 5 or 6 semesters | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| N with data | 77 | 79 | 121 |
| N with no data | 0 | 1 | 2 |

The usual pattern for these students was to spend two semesters at Harlem Prep, entering in the Fall semester and graduating at the end of the Spring semester. There appears to be a shift toward a slightly longer stay for the 1970 and 1971 groups than for the 1969 group. No one stayed longer than 6 semesters; a stay of more than 3 semesters was very rare.

A semester's work in the Fall or Spring term usually consisted of 5 or 6 courses, although there was some variation in the number of courses taken per semester.

## GRADES WHILE AT HARLEM PREP

Students stayed at Harlem Prep for differing lengths of time, and the total number of courses they took varied. Grades were therefore examined in relation to the total number of courses taken. Included in the total count were summer and six-week courses, but not audited courses or ones from which the student withdrew.

There were slight changes in the grading system from one year to the next. Grades of 1 or 2 (or A or B) are considered honor grades. Grades of 4 or 5 (or D) receive no credit. A grade of "Pass" was treated as a 3 (or C). Tabulations are presented separately for honor grades and for no-credit grades.

In interpreting the figures below, remember that they are for students who graduated from Harlem Prep and were accepted for college entrance.

PERCENTAGE OF ALL COURSES TAKEN AT HARLEM PREP IN WHICH THE GRADUATE RECEIVED HONOR GRADES

| | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 81 - 100% | 26% | 22% | 29% |
| 61 - 80% | 24 | 30 | 19 |
| 41 - 60% | 26 | 23 | 28 |
| 21 - 40% | 12 | 20 | 19 |
| 0 - 20% | 12 | 5 | 5 |
| | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| N with data | 76 | 79 | 120 |
| N with no data | 1 | 1 | 3 |

PERCENTAGE OF ALL COURSES TAKEN AT HARLEM PREP IN WHICH THE GRADUATE RECEIVED NO-CREDIT GRADES

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 - 20% | 87% | 92% | 78% |
| 21 - 40% | 7 | 4 | 19 |
| Over 40% | 6 | 4 | 3 |
| | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| N with data | 76 | 79 | 120 |
| N with no data | 1 | 1 | 3 |

The majority of graduates received honor grades in more than half their courses. Many graduates had no no-credit grades. There were, however, more no-credit grades in the 1971 group than in the 1969 and 1970 groups. It was relatively rare for graduates to receive no-credit grades in more than one-fifth of all the courses they took at Harlem Prep. When this happened, there seemed to be a consistent pattern for these graduates, namely, performing very poorly (all 4's or D's) in an early semester, and then improving considerably or greatly by the final semester at Harlem Prep.

PSAT SCORES

In 1969, only 2 students had PSAT scores recorded, so no distribution can be presented.

1970 and 1971 Scores

| | 1970 | | 1971 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Verbal | Math | Verbal | Math |
| 20 - 29 | 17% | 30% | 33% | 24% |
| 30 - 39 | 49 | 43 | 43 | 63 |
| 40 - 49 | 21 | 23 | 19 | 11 |
| 50 - 59 | 9 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
| 60 - 69 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| N with data | 53 | 53 | 54 | 54 |
| N with no data | 27 | 27 | 69 | 69 |

Students usually took these exams in October preceding their graduation. The range of Verbal scores was from 20 to 67, and the range of Math scores was from 21 to 67. No scores were available for about one-third of the 1970 students and more than half the 1971 students; this probably means that they did not take the PSAT. For those students who did take this test, the commonest score was in the 30's and the large majority of scores fell between 20 and 50. The Verbal scores were, in general, slightly higher than the Math scores.

SAT SCORES

| | 1969 | | 1970 | | 1971 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Verbal | Math | Verbal | Math | Verbal | Math |
| 200 - 299 | 24% | 15% | 20% | 16% | 16% | 13% |
| 300 - 399 | 35 | 59 | 45 | 55 | 46 | 55 |
| 400 - 499 | 29 | 22 | 24 | 19 | 22 | 26 |
| 500 - 599 | 11 | 4 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 6 |
| 600 - 699 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| N with data | 72 | 72 | 62 | 62 | 69 | 69 |
| N with no data | 5 | 5 | 18 | 18 | 54 | 54 |

Most students took the SAT just once, in the spring of the year in which they graduated from Harlem Prep. Most scores fell between 200 and 500; scores above 500 were relatively rare. For nearly one-fourth of the 1970 group and nearly half the 1971 group, no SAT scores were available in the student's folder.

If we multiply the PSAT scores by 10, we see that both the PSAT and SAT scores fell in the same range, from 200 to 500. Also, as with the PSAT, Verbal scores were generally slightly higher than the Math scores.

LOCATION OF ACCEPTING COLLEGES (1969 - 1971)

| | N |
|---|---|
| New York City | 32 |
| Other New York State | 32 |
| New England, Pa., N.J. | 28 |
| Midwest | 12 |
| South | 13 |
| West | 5 |
| Other countries | 3 |
| Total N | 125 |

About half the students were accepted by colleges in New York City and New York State. About one-fourth were accepted by colleges not very far from New York State.

The number of colleges accepting Harlem Prep graduates increased each year. These colleges represent a very great variety - public and private, small and large, highly prestigious and not-so-prestigious, two-year and four-year, technical and more general.

## FOLLOWUP INFORMATION ON A SAMPLE OF PRESUMED NONGRADUATES

Lists were obtained of students enrolled at Harlem Prep in September 1969, September 1970, and September 1971. From these lists we deleted the names of Harlem Prep graduates (through June 1972) and names of students still attending Harlem Prep. Names remaining were presumed to be nongraduates. Eight long-term staff members of Harlem Prep reviewed these lists and supplied whatever information they could. Results are shown below (in Ns, not percentages.)

| | Sept. 1969 | Sept. 1970 | Sept. 1971 |
|---|---|---|---|
| No information | 56 | 58 | 67 |
| Plan to return to H.P. | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| In program like H.P. | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Working | 6 | 6 | 10 |
| In college | 6 | 9 | 4 |
| Will attend college soon | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Went to college but left | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| In military service | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Serious medical problems | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Housewife | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Total N | 71 | 79 | 93 |

## ENROLLMENT FROM STREET ACADEMIES

Records on enrollment from street academies were available only for 1968 and 1969. Of the 35 graduates in 1968, 25 came from street academies. In September 1969, 27 new students were sent from street academies to Harlem Prep.

## VETERANS AT HARLEM PREP

Some records on veteran status of students at Harlem Prep were available for 1970, 1971, and 1972. In September 1970, 36 veterans were enrolled, and 5 of them graduated. Of the remaining 31, 14 dropped out before the end of their first semester. In September 1971, 57 veterans were enrolled. (Veterans' educational benefits became available to Harlem Prep in 1971.) Of these 57, 21 graduated. In September 1972, 35 veterans were enrolled; of these, 4 entered college in February 1973.

EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE OF CURRENT FACULTY

Currently the faculty numbers 33. Of these, 4 are administrative staff, 26 (including the nurse) are regular teachers, and 3 are part-time teachers. The two tables below show the amount of teaching experience the faculty members have had, and their educational level.

YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE (N=24 with information available)

| | |
|---|---|
| 3 | Over 15 years |
| 2 | 10 - 15 years |
| 3 | 5 - 9 years |
| 3 | 3 - 4 years |
| 13 | 1 - 2 years |

HIGHEST DEGREE RECEIVED (N=30 with information available)

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | Doctorate |
| 4 | Master's; now doctoral candidate |
| 4 | Master's |
| 2 | Bachelor's; now master's candidate |
| 11 | Bachelor's |
| 2 | Bachelor's candidate |
| 3 | Completed 3 1/2 years of college |
| 1 | In second year of college |
| 1 | State certified (in photography) |
| 1 | Never entered college |

Over two-thirds of the faculty members have at least a bachelor's degree. Over one-third have education beyond the bachelor's degree. Slightly less than half the faculty members have had over 2 years of teaching experience.

It is noteworthy that five members of the faculty are graduates of Harlem Prep, class of 1968. The colleges from which they graduated are Bard College, Ithaca College, Shaw University, SUNY at Buffalo, and Vassar College.

CURRICULUM: NUMBER OF COURSES OFFERED, BY DEPARTMENT

| | September 1969 | September 1970 | February 1971 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Social Studies | 19 | 21 | 21 |
| English | 11 | 12 | 16 |
| Mathematics | 4 (+ tutorials) | 6 | 9 |
| Science (including Health Education) | 10 | 6 | 7 |
| Art (several areas, including Film-making) | 3 | 5 | 11 |

STUDENT ATTENDANCE

The average daily attendance presented below is for the months of September, October, and November. Figures are approximate; they were obtained from checking attendance as listed on report cards and in teachers' roll books.

| Year | Total Register | Average Daily Attendance |
|---|---|---|
| 1968-69 | 183 | 151 |
| 1969-70 | 283 | 215 |
| 1970-71 | 400 | 293 |
| 1971-72 | 485 | 368 |

It should be noted that the attendance recording procedures at Harlem Prep are much more stringent than those in New York City public high schools. To be considered "present" on any given day, a student must attend all classes for which he is scheduled on that day.

STUDENT COSTS

The figures below are for the 1968-69, 1969-70, 1970-71, and 1971-72 school years. The figures for the 1971-72 school year have been broken down according to categories used by the New York City Board of Education, and do not include the Upward Bound summer program.

| Year | Total Budget | No. of Students | Cost per Student |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1968-69 | $ 285,980 | 183 | $ 1,562 |
| 1969-70 | 354,428 | 283 | 1,252 |
| 1970-71 | 638,053 | 400 | 1,594 |
| 1971-72 | 621,349 | 485 | 1,281 |

For 1971-72, according to the audited financial report and using the categories created by the New York City Board of Education, the cost per student is as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Direct Instructional Costs | | |
| Personal services | | $ 848 |
| Instructional | 470 | |
| Supportive | 378 | |
| Other than personal services[1] (including supplies and equipment and fringe benefits) | | 295 |
| Plant Operations[2] | | 138 |
| TOTAL | | $ 1,281 |

1. If fringe benefits are excluded as they are by the New York City Board of Education, the "Other than personal services" category is reduced to $186 per student, for a total cost per student of $1,172.

2. If amortization of capital costs is excluded, as is done by the New York City Board of Education, the "Plant Operations" category is reduced to $112.

THE CHASE MANHATTAN BANK
National Association

1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, New York 10015

FRANCIS X. SHEA *Vice President*

June 20, 1973

Dr. Dale E. Bussis
Vice President and Secretary
Institute for Educational Development
52 Vanderbilt Avenue
New York, New York 10017

Dear Dr. Bussis:

As Treasurer of Harlem Preparatory School, Inc., I am pleased to submit with this letter a copy of its audited statement prepared by Lucas, Tucker & Co., Certified Public Accountants, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1972.

I hope this statement will prove useful to you as part of your study of the Harlem Preparatory School Program.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

Enclosure

RESUMES OF SITE VISITORS: FREDERICK J. KOURY, ROBERT C. ATMORE, AND HENRY N. DREWRY

FREDERICK J. KOURY, Director
City-As-School
131 Livingston Street
Room 213
Brooklyn, New York 11201

EDUCATION

Syracuse University, BA, 1949
New York University, MA
Teachers College
Columbia University, MA
Brooklyn College )Graduate Work
New York University)Administration

TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Francis Scott Key Junior High School - teacher of English and Social Studies
George W. Wingate High School - teacher of English
John Dewey High School - Chairman of English and Speech

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Chairman of English and Language Arts Committee of UFT..ELAC
President-elect of Chairmen's Section, New York State English Council
Vice President, New York State English Council
National Council of Teachers of English
United Federation of Teachers
International Reading Association

Robert Craig Atmore, The Choate School, Wallingford, Connecticut 06492
Born 1912, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Wife's name - Edith W. Atmore

EDUCATION

William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Haverford College, B.A., 1934 - Major in German
Yale University, M.A., 1942 and Ph.D., 1952 in Education
Graduate work also at University of Pennsylvania, Temple University, and Columbia Library School

JOBS HELD

Franklin School, Pennsylvania Hospital for Nervous Diseases - 1935
Keewaydin Camps - Counselor - 1932-37.
The Choate School - English, History, Housemaster, Director of Library, Founder of A-V Program, Public Speaking, Director of Activities to arrange for visiting speakers, summer opportunities information, member of senior committees. 1935 - present.
Fulbright Exchange Teacher in Freiburg, Germany, 1954-55.
Leave of absence to promote Search for Black Teachers for Independent Schools and do research on training and educational techniques developed by industry - 1968.

TRAVEL

Most of U.S.A. Most of Western Europe, South Seas, Japan, Egypt, India and Southeast Asia, Mexico, Virgin Islands, Alaska.

WAR SERVICE

Assistant Area Director, American Red Cross in New Caledonia, Solomon Islands, Okinawa, and Japan - 1943-46.

Past and Present Activities

Founder of small boys' clubs in Wallingford which became a branch of the YMCA. Member of YMCA Board.
Vestry of St. Paul's Episcopal Church.
Special Committee to study Wallingford's social service needs.
Executive Committee of Secondary Education Board.
A-V Committee of National Association of Independent Schools.
Board of Roothbert Foundation which provides funds for individual's spiritual development.
Founder of A SEARCH FOR BLACK TEACHERS FOR INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS - with Mrs. Atmore.
Teachers' Council of Connecticut Association of Independent Schools.
Chairman of Board, The Foster School, New Haven, Connecticut.
Founder of ISSUE, summer program for urban education for independent school students.
Researcher in training and educational techniques developed by industry which schools should adopt.
Proposer of a plan, not yet activated, for an independent school urban school-hostel where students in "rural" boarding schools could spend time studying in an urban situation.

Biographical Information
HENRY N. DREWRY
Director, Office of Teacher Preparation and Placement
Lecturer in History with Rank of Professor
Princeton University

A master teacher on the secondary school level, Henry N. Drewry left a position as Chairman of the Social Studies Department at Princeton (N.J.) High School in 1968 to accept appointment in the Princeton University administration as Director of the Office of Teacher Preparation and Placement.

The office combines oversight of the development of an undergraduate program preparing students for public school teaching with assisting undergraduate and graduate students seeking teaching and administrative appointments in both schools and colleges.

Mr. Drewry also provides leadership in exploring Princeton's role in the education of the disadvantaged and is the University's prime liaison with secondary school education, especially in the State of New Jersey.

Recipient of an A.B. degree from Talladega College in 1948--an education interrupted by three years of World War II duty with the U.S. Army Air Force in the Far East--Mr. Drewry earned an M.A. degree in 1949 from Teachers College of Columbia University and has taken additional work there, at Rutgers University, Stanford, and at Yale.

He has been the recipient of the William Robertson Coe Fellowship, administered by the Institute of American History, Stanford; the Eagleton Institute-New Jersey Society Fellowship; a John Hay Fellowship for study at Yale; and the highly-regarded Distinguished Secondary School Teacher Award, administered by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of Harvard University. In January 1972 he was named Master of Woodrow Wilson College at Princeton University.

Mr. Drewry's career began in 1949 when he taught history at North Carolina Agricultural and Technical College, Greensboro, N.C. He left there in 1951 for a year of additional study at Columbia. From 1952-54 he worked as a claims assistant with the Social Security Administration in Trenton, N.J.

He accepted appointment as a history teacher at Princeton (N.J.) High School in 1954, beginning a 14-year association with the school system which earned him broad recognition in the community. In 1960 he was named Chairman of the school's Social Studies Department.

During the summers of 1965, '66, and '67, Mr. Drewry served as a faculty member in Princeton University's Summer Institute for Teachers of History.

Recently re-elected to the presidency of the Princeton Association on Human Rights and a Trustee of Mercer County Community College, Talladega College, and The Choate School, Mr. Drewry had been a Director of the Princeton YMCA and was active in establishing the Princeton Study Center, a volunteer-staffed facility offering Princeton school children tutorial help in the evenings and over weekends.

He also is active in a number of professional organizations. He is a member of the Human Rights Committee of the New Jersey Education Association and serves on the Executive Committee of the New Jersey Council for Social Studies.

He is a member of the American Historical Association's Committee on Teaching, the American History and Social Studies Test Committee of the College Entrance Examination Board, and the Advisory Committee of the African-American Institute. He also has been associated with the Princeton Tercentenary Committee, the National Education Association, the National Council for the Social Studies, the NAACP, and the Advisory Committee of the Princeton League of Women Voters.

In addition to his administrative duties at Princeton, Mr. Drewry holds the faculty rank of Lecturer with the rank of Professor in History. He has developed, and is directing, a senior-level course on Afro-American History, "exploring," in his words, "how and why the American race situation became what it is today."

He is the author, with Professor Frank Freidel of Harvard University, of America: A Modern History of the United States. His recent publications include a widely acclaimed article, "America Rationalizing Slavery Produced Racism," which appeared in the Summer 1969 Issue of University: A Princeton Quarterly.